45,792

**Remarks** 

Dated: July 1, 2005

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-7 are under consideration.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS** 

The Examiner has objected to claim 1 because it recites non-elected SEQ ID NOs.

Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 1 to remove the recitation to non-elected SEQ ID

NOs. Applicants believe that the present rejection is now moot.

THE §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph alleging that

the Specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to practice the invention

commensurate with the scope of the claims as filed. The Examiner stated that the Specification

does not reasonably provide enablement for isolated soluble receptor comprising SEQ ID NO:12

and SEQ ID NO:15. Specifically, the Examiner has alleged that although the Specification has

disclosed how to make a heterodimer comprising the full-length IL-20 receptor subunits and

immunoglobulin, it fails to disclose whether said heterodimer is functional; nor does it disclose

how to make the soluble receptor of claim 1.

Applicants strongly disagree with the Examiner's statement. However, in order to

expedite prosecution and allowance of the present invention, Applicants have amended claim 1 to

now recite "an isolated IL-20 receptor" that comprises the full-length IL-20 receptor subunits.

Applicants are in no way disclaiming any subject matter and reserve the right to prosecute these

claims at a later date. Accordingly, in light of the above amendments, Applicants believe that the

present rejection is now moot.

THE §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

The Examiner has rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph alleging that

claim 5 is indefinite for reciting "at least one cysteine residue."

Page 4 of 5

Dated: July 1, 2005

Applicants have amended claim 5 to now recite "wherein each of said polypeptide linkers comprise one cysteine residue." In light of the present amendment, Applicants believe that the

present rejection is now moot.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 6 and claim 7, as dependent therefrom, under 35

U.S.C. §112, second paragraph alleging that claim 6 is indefinite for reciting "subunit is fused to

all or a portion of the constant region."

Applicants have amended claim 6, and hence claim 7, to now recite "fused to the constant

region." In light of the present amendment, Applicants believe that the present rejection is now

moot.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the Application, the Examiner is encouraged

to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 1, 2005

Shelby J. Walker, Reg. No. 45,192

Attorney for Applicants

ZYMOGENETICS, INC.

1201 Eastlake Avenue East

Seattle, Washington 98102-3702

Tel: (206) 442-6558

Fax: (206) 442-6678

Enclosures:

Petition and Fee for Extension of Time (in duplicate)

Amendment Fee Transmittal (in duplicate)

Postcard

H:\Patents\Shelby\99-107\US\Response to the March 9 2005 Office Action.doc

Page 5 of 5